

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 15-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 17, 23, 24, 26, 29, 32 and 35 have been amended, and Claims 12-14 have been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected Claims 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the definition of the "medium" in the Specification includes both tangible and intangible forms, and that the intangible form is non-statutory under 35 USC 101. Applicants have amended Claims 32 and 35 to include the word "tangible" and thus it is urged that Claims 32-37 are statutory under 35 USC 101.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 12-13, 15-26, 28-32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by England (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, such claim has been amended to recite features pertaining to selection and availability of expert servers and experts. Specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to recite "responsive to the request for the interactive expertise session, providing a list of expert web servers having experts registered in a given subject matter as specified by a user initiating the request" and "responsive to selecting at least one of the expert web servers by the user, determining availability of the experts registered with the selected at least one expert web server", as described in the preferred embodiment at Specification page 21, lines 2-15. These claimed features advantageously provide an ability to organize experts using expert web servers, such that a plurality of experts from a diverse base of various subject matters can be provided using a uniform interface from the perspective of a requestor of the service. The availability of registered

experts for a selected server is also automatically determined. The cited England reference merely provides a list of help topics (Fig 10, element 1004), and is with respect to a single server (Figure 5, element 502). It is thus urged that the amendment to Claim 1 has overcome the 35 USC 103 rejection.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2-9, 15 and 16 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-9, 15 and 16 depend upon).

With respect to Claim 17, such claim has been amended to recite "upon termination of the interactive expertise session, calculating a charge for the interactive expertise session based upon fees provided by the expert; and displaying the charge to the requestor of the interactive expertise session", such features also being recited in Claim 10. Applicants traverse the rejection of amended Claim 17 for similar reasons to those given below with respect to Claim 10.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 18-22 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 17 (of which Claims 18-22 depend upon).

With respect to Claim 23, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given below with respect to Claim 10.

With respect to Claims 24 (and dependent Claim 25) and 26 (and dependent Claims 27 and 28), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 29 (and dependent Claims 30 and 31), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 17.

With respect to Claim 32 (and dependent Claim 34), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 35 (and dependent Claims 36 and 37), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 17.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-13, 15-26, 28-32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claims 10-11, 14, 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over England (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991) in view of Crosskey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 10, such claim recites "upon termination of the interactive expertise session, calculating a charge for the interactive expertise session using information provided by at least one of the experts which participated in the interactive expertise session; and displaying the charge to the requestor of the interactive expertise session". In rejecting Claim 10, the Examiner cites Closskey as showing Web pages that can be used to display billing responsibility of the users for accessing the Web (e.g. Col. 2, lines 61-62) and computing the billing amount of each data transfer associated with the Web pages (citing Col. 3, lines 42-45). Applicants urge that even assuming such assertions are true, these assertions do not establish any teaching or suggestion of (i) calculating a charge that is *associated with an expert*, or (ii) *displaying the charge* to the requestor of the interactive expertise session. Because all of the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references – and in particular there is no teaching or suggestion of "calculating means, upon termination of the interactive expertise session, for calculating a charge for the interactive expertise session using information provided by at least one of the experts which participated in the interactive expertise session; and displaying means for displaying the charge to the requestor of the interactive expertise session" - it is urged that Claim 10 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

The features of Claim 10 provide further improvements in the graphical user interface used by a requestor, where in addition to providing a list of expert web servers for selection, and two display portions for user coaction, the charges incurred for a given interactive session are also provided to the requestor – thus further facilitating ease of operability by a requestor.

Claim 14 has been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer.

With respect to Claims 27 and 33, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 10.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 10-11, 14, 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 7/20/05

Respectfully submitted,



Duke W. Yee
Reg. No. 34,285
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicants